



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,663	10/25/2000	Henry N. Holtzman	PRT-004	4174
51414 7590 07/27/2007 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP PATENT ADMINISTRATOR EXCHANGE PLACE BOSTON, MA 02109-2881			EXAMINER WINTER, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT 3621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/696,663

**Applicant(s)**

HOLTZMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

John M. Winter

**Art Unit**

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 32-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 32-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Acknowledgements*

The Applicants amendment filed on May 16, 2007 is acknowledged, Claims 1-15 were previously pending, claims 32-36 have been appended. Currently Claims 1-15 and 32-36 are pending.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### *Response to Arguments*

The Applicants arguments filed on May 16, 2007 have been fully considered. The Applicant states that the payment systems of Janning, Smith, and Pare Jr. do not teach or suggest using an identifier associated with a physical token to obtain customer data.

The Examiner responds that this feature is disclosed by Pare Jr., (Abstract – a biometric Identifier is an “identifier associated with a physical token” e.g .finger)

Art Unit: 3621

The payment systems of Janning, Smith, and Pare Jr. do not teach or suggest preparing a customer order that was identified in customer data obtained in response to an identifier.

The Examiner responds that this feature is disclosed by Janning, Column 3 line 65- Column 4 line 17; the product dispenser dispenses the product (preparing a customer order), it is obvious that in order to prepare an order, an order would have to be received –e.g. identified in customer data

The reference Smith et al. (US Patent 6,487,540) has been withdrawn.

See following rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 12, 14-15 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janning et al. (US patent 6,446,049) in view of Pare, Jr et al. (US Patent 6,662,166).

As per claim 1,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses a computer-based method for selling an item to a customer at a physical retail location, the method comprising the steps of

Art Unit: 3621

receiving at the physical retail location an identifier associated with a token presented by a customer at the physical retail location;(Column 8, lines 20-28)

preparing the identified customer order at the retail location;(Figure 1)

executing payment by the customer for the selected order by the preferred payment method;(Column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 1-32)

providing the customer with the selected order at the retail location.(Column 10, lines 35-38)

identifying in the customer data a product order selected by the customer. (Column 3, line 65 – column 4 line 17

identifying in the customer data a preferred payment method for the customer.(Column 22 lines 47-58)

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose accessing customer data from a database located somewhere other than the token based on the received identifier associated with the token; Pare Jr. et al ('166) discloses accessing customer data from a database located somewhere other than the token based on the received identifier associated with the token; (Column 12, lines 5-23). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with Pare Jr. et al's teaching of accessing customer data in order to more efficiently serve the customer.

As per claim 2,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Art Unit: 3621

wherein the token comprises an RFID tag, and step (a) comprises wirelessly reading a RFID tag presented by the customer.(Column 6, lines 15-42; also figure 1)

As per claim 3,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 2,

wherein the steps are performed in response to a single user action, the single user action comprising presenting the RFID tag to an RFID reader located in the retail location.(Column 8, lines 1-52, also figure 3)

As per claim 4,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well know in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location that the token comprises a magnetic stripe card, and step (a) comprises reading a magnetic stripe card presented by a customer to a magnetic stripe reader. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a magnetic card and reader because this is an inexpensive well known method of conducting commerce. The examiner notes that this technique is commonly utilized by any credit or ATM card.

As per claim 5,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 4,

Art Unit: 3621

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location that the steps are performed in response to a single user action, the single user action comprising presenting the magnetic stripe card to a customer accessible magnetic stripe card reader located in the retail location. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a single user action of presenting a magnetic stripe card to a card reader at a retail location would occur because this is an inexpensive and well known method of conducting commerce. The examiner notes that this technique is commonly utilized by any credit or ATM card.

As per claim 32,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of electronic commerce to receive at a web site, a product order from a customer. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a web site for purchasing products in order to provide a more accessible user interface to the products.

As per claims 33-36,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 32,

wherein the product order comprises an order for a beverage. (Abstract – Examiner notes that Janning discloses a vending [e.g. sales] process, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that once the process for vending an item has been established, the process could be

Art Unit: 3621

adapted to sell tickets, beverages, food or any other type of retail good. )

Claims 6-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janning et al. (US patent 6,446,049) in view of Pare, Jr et al. (US Patent 6,662,166) and further in view of O'Hagan (US Patent 6,314,406).

As per claim 6,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose the steps of facilitating customer selection of a product order; and associating the customer selected product order with the customer. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses the steps of facilitating customer selection of a product order;(Figure 23) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al's teaching of facilitating customer selection of a product order.

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose associating the customer selected product order with the customer. Smith et al ('540) discloses associating the customer selected product order with the customer. (column 6, lines 9-34) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with Smith et al's teaching of identifying in the customer data a product order selected by the customer in order to more efficiently serve the customer by offloading the process of receipt generation to the customers device.



As per claim 7,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 6,

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose facilitating customer selection via the Internet. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses facilitating customer selection via the Internet; (Column 3, lines 16-24) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al.'s teaching of facilitating customer selection via the Internet because the internet is an inexpensive and efficient medium to reach the customer.

As per claim 8,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 6,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well know in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location to facilitate customer selection at a terminal located in the retail location. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to facilitate customer selection at a terminal located in the retail location because this allows the customer to select items from the immediate inventory of the store and prevents aggravation caused by the necessity to order items.

As per claim 9,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Art Unit: 3621

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose accessing customer data over the Internet. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses accessing customer data over the Internet; (Column 3, lines 16-24). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al.'s teaching of accessing customer data over the Internet because reduces the overhead cost of maintaining the store by reducing the number of database servers needed to complete a transaction

As per claim 10,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose accessing customer data over a local area network. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses accessing customer data over a local area network; (Figure 17) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al.'s teaching of accessing customer data over a local area network because reduces the overhead cost of maintaining the store by reducing the number of database servers needed to complete a transaction

As per claim 11,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose accessing customer data from a local database. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses accessing customer data from a local database. (Figure 17) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al.'s teaching of accessing customer data from

Art Unit: 3621

a local database because increased the reliability of the system by allowing information to be accessible even if the network is inoperable.

As per claim 12,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well know in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location to access customer data from a database operated from a third party service provider. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to access customer data from a database operated from a third party service provider because this is a cost effective way to verify the credentials of customer. The examiner notes that this feature is routinely provided by credit rating services such as Equifax.

As per claim 13,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Janning et al. ('049) does not explicitly disclose providing payment information to a POS device for execution. O'Hagan et al. ('406) discloses providing payment information to a POS device for execution. (Figure 18) It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Janning et al.'s method with O'Hagan et al.'s teaching of providing payment information to a POS device for execution because this allows the merchant to realize a profit on the transaction

As per claim 14,

Art Unit: 3621

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location to process payment and provide an execution code indicating complete payment to a POS device. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to process payment and provide an execution code indicating complete payment to a POS device because this allows the merchant to realize a profit on the transaction. The examiner notes that this feature is common to a majority of POS systems.

As per claim 15,

Janning et al. ('049) discloses the method of claim 1,

Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of selling an item to a customer at a retail location to obtain a count value associated with the token and if the count value is greater than zero, decrementing the count value. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to obtain a count value associated with the token and if the count value is greater than zero, decrement the count value because this encourages the customer loyalty. The examiner notes that this feature is common to promotional sales programs where the customer is "rewarded" after a certain number of purchases are made.

### ***Conclusion***

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific

Art Unit: 3621

limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Also in accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that Nathan J. Muller's Desktop Encyclopedia of the Internet, ("Desktop Encyclopedia") is additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Muller's Desktop Encyclopedia is a practical reference that clearly explains Internet services, applications, protocols, access methods, development tools, administration and management, standards, and regulations. Because of the reference's basic content (which is self-evident upon examination of the reference) and after further review of the entire record including the prior art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that the Desktop Encyclopedia is primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art. Because the reference is directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within the Desktop Encyclopedia.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

Art Unit: 3621


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John Winter

Patent Examiner -- 3621



ANDREW J. FISCHER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600